1. The Columbia University Urban Planning Studio is strictly a volunteer experience and in no way does this project/study enable or characterize students as Government employees in any nature.

2. Students have voluntarily chosen to participate in the Columbia University Urban Planning Studio and will be receiving academic credit towards their master’s degree in urban planning.

3. The intention of the Columbia University Planning Studio is to provide students the educational opportunity to learn real world planning issues. NAVFAC Washington has provided limited oversight to the students to ensure these issues were analyzed properly.

4. Students have not had access to any classified information or classified areas. No classified information has been presented or prepared in this report.

Students were treated as any other public visitor to the WNY and were granted access via the WNY Visitor’s Center and complied with all military installation security rules, regulations, requirements, and day-to-day operational changes.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Columbia University planning studio was tasked with developing elements of a small area plan for the Washington Navy Yard. The US Navy specifically wanted the studio to address underutilized land at cultural resources, limited food options for public visitors, and public access to the Riverwalk and the Man in the Sea Memorial. Over the past few months, the studio team conducted multiple site visits and several lines of research, as well as meetings with base leadership to finalize the planning recommendations.

After the initial site visit and further evaluation of the planning goals, the studio team created the following vision statement to guide the planning process:

*The Washington Navy Yard seeks to promote its rich heritage through the enhancement of its existing base assets. The proposal will create access to additional and improved services and cultural resources at the Navy Yard to better serve the needs of its employees and visitors.*

The studio team then identified major stakeholders and objectives in order to proceed with recommendations for the Washington Navy Yard. The three major stakeholders in this planning process were the following: personnel based in the Navy Yard, the local community, and visitors to the Navy Yard. These stakeholders were considered in each of the following planning objectives: improve wayfinding, activate open space, and improve food options. Furthermore, the studio team recognized the US Navy’s financial limitations and provided a number of options for each area of focus that can be implemented incrementally, as policy and financing allows.

In order to address the first objective to improve wayfinding, the studio team proposes a new, comprehensive program that provides visitors with a clearly defined series of routes within the Navy Yard. To address the need to improve visitor circulation as well as to ensure the safe and continued operation of the base, the team offers the Prioritized Access to Heritage (PATH) system, a comprehensive signage program that navigates visitors to points of interest while educating them about Navy history.

The studio team’s second objective is to activate open space, including through better utilization of the Riverwalk. The Navy Yard Riverwalk is now open, but it does not accomplish the goal of becoming an integral part of the city and encouraging visitors to explore the Navy Yard’s cultural resources. Even so, the existing Navy Yard Riverwalk is a pleasant space to walk; it is well designed and provides access to the *USS Barry*. For this reason, recommendations include creating programs that increase activity along the waterfront and better connect visitors to the Yard’s history and heritage. Furthermore, the studio team recommends new landscape features and additional benches that will turn the Riverwalk into a place people will choose to utilize.

Another way to activate open space is the transformation of West Leutze Park. Currently, the area west of the ceremonial Admiral Leutze Park has a steep grade and is difficult to access due to an existing retaining wall. The studio team proposes multiple ways to address this. The addition of stairs in place of the retaining wall would allow people to access the park more easily. A more significant change would create an amphitheater setting to serve various functions.
The final objective is to improve food options. Currently, fast food dominates the selection for personnel. These options are clustered in a way that leaves areas of the installation without quick and easy access. Personnel object to the quantity and quality of food and, in turn, want more and healthier food options. Moreover, introducing more visitors and employees on base will place greater demands on existing food vendors. The studio recommends introducing a mixture of mobile and stationary structures. These can adapt to visitor and employee demand, while being sensitive to the Navy Yard’s budget.

These proposals are closely linked. Changes both in Navy policy and physical alterations to the Navy Yard will allow the Navy to better connect its assets to the surrounding community, raise visitor awareness of the Navy Yard as a cultural attraction in Washington, DC, improve employee morale and wellness, and enhance the overall image of the US Navy. Furthermore, the implementation of one proposal will only strengthen the others, and together they fulfill the goals of the vision statement and satisfy the issues presented to the team by the US Navy.
PROJECT

PURPOSE OF STUDY

NAVFAC Washington approached Columbia University's Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation to organize an urban planning studio to assess three critical needs of the Washington Navy Yard. All three issues individually require considerable study, but together encompass a significant investment.

Our client, the Naval Facilities and Engineering Command (NAVFAC) Washington, presented three unique, yet interrelated, issues:

I. Underutilized land at cultural resources
II. Limited food options for public visitors
III. Public access to the Riverwalk and the Man in the Sea Memorial

We visited the Navy Yard to assess the situation on the ground. After meeting with NAVFAC personnel and consulting other Navy Yard employees, we created a vision statement to guide us during the planning process:

*The Washington Navy Yard seeks to promote its rich heritage through the enhancement of its existing base assets. The proposal will create access to additional and improved services and cultural resources at the Navy Yard to better serve the needs of its employees and visitors.*

METHODOLOGY

The delivery of substantive, creative proposals require the utilization of diverse research methods to better understand the Washington Navy Yard and its surrounding community. This began with the study of numerous documents, such as master plans, design criteria, building population counts, and Capitol Riverfront BID materials provided by the US Navy. In addition, individual research was conducted regarding transportation, demographics, and food options in the surrounding area.

Preliminary research was enhanced by two site visits to the Navy Yard that informed understanding of visitor experience and access issues walking to the base. While on the Yard, an existing conditions inventory of the most important cultural heritage sites was conducted. These sites were mapped and coordinated using GPS technology. Using this information, a spatial analysis of heritage sites and their proximity to each other was conducted. Furthermore, an existing conditions inventory of current food options was conducted and also later mapped.

Field research was supplemented through multiple interviews with a diverse group of Navy Yard employees, including Naval Facilities and Engineering Command (NAVFAC), the Community Plans and Liaison Officer (CPLO), Navy Exchange (NEX), and members of the Navy's Naval History and Heritage Command (NHHC), among others. Finally, we employed exhaustive precedent research to inspire and shape our proposals.
NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT

The Navy Yard is located in the Near Southeast neighborhood of Washington, DC, an area that has seen drastic changes over the last decade. With a growing population accompanied by economic and land development change, the Navy Yard today is surrounded by a different neighborhood than it was 10 years ago. As initial commercial and real estate investments in the neighborhood spurred development, the neighborhood added residents that were highly educated and primarily white. The following will highlight some of these changes occurring outside of the wall of the Navy Yard, providing information on the new neighborhood and how the Navy Yard can incorporate its assets into the surrounding community.

NEIGHBORHOOD OVERVIEW

The Near Southeast neighborhood is located along the Anacostia River and has a current population of 2,700 residents. In addition to the Navy Yard Metro stop, the neighborhood is also serviced by a number of bus stops [Figure 1].

The population of the neighborhood has experienced significant growth from 600 residents in 2005 to 2,700 in 2010 [Figure 2]. The racial make up of the neighborhood has also changed significantly over the past five years. In 2005, 70% of the population was black and 20% white. Today, 30% of the population is black and the white population has grown to represent 60% of the population. Educational attainment has increased from 45% of the population having a high school diploma in 2000 to 77% in 2005, according to the American Community Survey [Figure 3]. Consistent with this

FIG 1. TRANSPORTATION SERVICE IN NEAR SOUTHEAST

Source: DC.gov
change, crime rates have decreased from a 2003 high of 75 violent crimes to only 11 violent crimes in 2009. Property crimes saw a similar decline from a high of 310 in 2002 to 64 in 2009 [Figure 4].

The employment of residents in the neighborhood varies across sectors [Figure 5]. According to the US Census, the neighborhood’s increased employment sectors include 16% in the public sector, 18% professional, and 28% in the education and health care services. As these numbers only include civilian employment industries there is also a high rate of employment in the Armed Forces members, with 12% of residents being employed by the military. This is much greater than the less than 1% of DC residents employed by the military. This large figure includes military personnel living on the naval base and in the nearby Marine Barracks.

OVERVIEW OF NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT

The Near Southeast neighborhood has seen growth in a number of areas from the population to financial investment in new developments. This growth in population is primarily the result of significant private and public capital investments during the past decade facilitated by the establishment of the Capitol Riverfront BID in 2006. The BID’s work has resulted in the addition of over 10 million square feet to the built fabric of the neighborhood—with an additional 25 million square feet slated for development [Figure 6]. The BID has given the neighborhood a new voice, providing a place for the Navy to now communicate outside of the base walls.

In 2008, the BID secured the relocation of the city’s baseball team into a new stadium in the

FIG 2. DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE IN NEAR SOUTHEAST
Source: US Census Bureau, American Fact Finder Community Survey (2005-2009)

FIG 3. EDUCATION CHANGE IN NEAR SOUTHEAST
Source: US Census Bureau, American Fact Finder Community Survey (2005-2009)
neighborhood, which became a catalyst for more of the planned and completed development today. Located along the western border of the neighborhood, Nationals Park has become one of the defining landmarks of the neighborhood, attracting crowds of over 40,000.

Another of the most recent developments, the Yards Park, has direct significance to the Washington Navy Yard as the property abuts the Washington Navy Yard on the Anacostia River. The Yards Park has added to the growing amenities in the neighborhood. It is a starting point for a number of planned developments for the area, connecting parts of the river with bridges for easier pedestrian accessibility and the development of more amenities such as restaurants and a marina. Detailed descriptions of these planned developments can be found in Appendix A (p 54).

The growth of the neighborhood has been further supported by a number of DC policy initiatives starting with the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative (AWI), in which the entire Anacostia riverfront will be opened for public use. The Yards Park is a direct result of this larger city initiative and the proposals presented in this report follow the goals of the AWI. The neighborhood and the Navy Yard are influenced by a number of other DC city policy initiatives that were taken into account when developing the proposals presented in this report. For a detailed description of relevant policy initiatives see Appendix C (p 60).

Historically, the Near Southeast neighborhood has not had a major employer other than the US Navy. The recent developments supported by the BID have included the new Department of Transportation Headquarters, Forest City Washington, and Nationals Park. Now with a daytime population of 35,000, the neighborhood has become a major employment center in Washington, DC.

FIG 4. CRIME CHANGE IN NEAR SOUTHEAST
Source: SOURCE?

FIG 5. MAJOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES
Source: US Census Bureau, American Fact Finder Community Survey (2005-2009)
The opportunities, challenges and strengths presented by the changing neighborhood offer the US Navy a number of important opportunities. A full Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis can be found in Appendix B (p 58).

CONCLUSION

The Near Southeast neighborhood provides a unique landscape for the city of Washington, DC and the future of the Washington Navy Yard. Understanding the community is vital for any party that looks to generate any benefit from the area. The changing character of the neighborhood has been thoroughly examined and analyzed in the development of the proposals presented in this report. The Washington Navy Yard should look to understand the changing community outside of its walls in the implementation of these proposals.

FIG 6. NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS
THE BID HAS FACILITATED THE DEVELOPMENT OF OVER 30 MILLION SQUARE FEET OF RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, AND OFFICE DEVELOPMENT AS REPRESENTED IN BLUE.
Source: Capitol Riverfront BID, October 2010 Report, NeighborhoodInfo DC
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

The Washington Navy Yard is steeped not only in the Naval Service’s rich tradition, but also American history. The Yard traces its roots to the founding of the country: Benjamin Stoddert, the first Secretary of the Navy, authorized the construction of the facility for use by the newly established federal government on October 2, 1799.

The Navy Yard’s location was chosen for its strategic defense position. Red brick walls, since painted white, were erected along 9th and M Streets SE after the War of 1812. It was during these early years that the base became an important shipbuilding and ship fitting facility. Most notably, the USS Constitution (“Old Ironsides”) was refitted and prepared for battle at the Yard’s dock facilities.

The War of 1812 against the British was a trying time for the Washington Navy Yard. In response to the impending British invasion of Washington DC, Captain Thomas Tingey, then commander of the Yard, ordered the immolation of the base to prevent it and its unfinished ships from entering enemy hands. Only Latrobe Gate and a few other structures survived the blaze. At the end of the war, the base commander ordered the brick walls be increased in height to prevent local looters from doing further damage to the recovering base.

In the aftermath of the war, it was decided that the Washington Navy Yard should solely be a shipbuilding facility rather than a full-fledged Naval base. Weaponry and technology then dictated the character of the Yard for many years. By the mid-19th century, the Yard’s primary output was ordnance. During the Civil War it served as a secure location for President Lincoln, who often stayed at the Commandant’s House (Building 1) as a safety measure. The body of Lincoln’s killer, John Wilkes Booth, was examined at the Yard.

Through changes in industry and technology, the Navy Yard proved resilient. The era of wood sailing ships passed and the Industrial Revolution took over. The Yard became an industrial plant producing nautical support machinery to keep America’s ever-expanding Navy at sea. By the mid-1880s the Yard was the most important manufacturing plant in the DC area. In 1886, the Yard was designated as the sole site of ordnance production for the entire US Navy. It even produced weaponry for America’s World War I allies.

Between the first and second World Wars, the Yard became famous for its celebrity appeal. Charles Lindbergh visited the base after his famous transatlantic flight and King George VI also visited during his trip to America in 1939.

By World War II, the Yard was the largest naval ordnance plant in the world. In December 1945, the Navy Yard was renamed the US Naval Gun Factory. Ordnance work continued for some years after World War II, until finally phased out in 1961. The weapons designed and built at the Yard were used in all wars that the United States fought until the 1960s. Then, on July 1, 1964, the base was designated the Washington Navy Yard. At its peak, the Yard consisted of 188 buildings on 126 acres of land and employed nearly 25,000 people. Soon, the deserted factory buildings began to be converted to office use and presently serve the same function.

Due to the incredible history and heritage preserved on the Yard, the Washington Navy Yard is designated a National Register for Historic Places Historic District.
**PRESENT CONDITIONS**

Presently, the Washington Navy Yard is host to a number of tenant commands for the US Navy, including the Naval Sea Systems (NAVSEA), Naval Facilities and Engineering Command (NAVFAC), and the Office of the Judge Advocate General (OJAG), to name just a few. Eight major commands make up the majority of the Yard’s approximately 15,500 personnel. They are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC)</strong></td>
<td>CNIC’s mission is to enable the Navy’s Operating Concept through Enterprise alignment of all shore installation support to the Fleet, Fighter, and Family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Support Activity (FSA)</strong></td>
<td>The mission of FSA is to establish, maintain, and provide a system of financial services as the BSO/PAO for assigned unified commands, Navy Headquarters, and activities; to initiate action in matters pertaining to the provision of funds and manpower and to evaluate the utilization of such resources and initiate or recommend appropriate corrective action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of the Naval Inspector General (NAVINSGEN)</strong></td>
<td>The mission of NAVINSGEN is to be “the conscience of the Navy”, providing sound and impartial advice to senior Naval leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of the Judge Advocate General (OJAG)</strong></td>
<td>The mission of OJAG is extensive, embracing virtually all aspects of Department of the Navy activities, and is grounded in both law and regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military Sealift Command (MSC)</strong></td>
<td>The mission of MSC is to provide ocean transportation of equipment, fuel, supplies, and ammunition to sustain US forces worldwide during peacetime and in war for as long as operational requirements dictate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Naval Facilities and Engineering Command (NAVFAC)</strong></td>
<td>NAVFAC delivers best value facilities engineering and acquisition for the Navy and Marine Corps, Unified Commanders, and Department of Defense agencies through six business lines: Capital Improvements, Environmental, Real Estate, Public Works, Base Development, and Contingency Engineering. Their annual volume of business is in excess of $7.6 billion. In addition, NAVFAC provides program management for all aspects of the Naval Construction Force, the Seabees, and equipment/material management for the Naval Beach Group and other Naval Special Operating Units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA)</strong></td>
<td>NAVSEA is the largest of the US Navy’s five systems commands, relying on more than 36,700 civilians and Sailors, along with thousands of private industry contractors, to design, engineer, integrate, build, and procure ships, shipboard weapons, and shipboard combat systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command - National Capital Region (SPAWAR)</strong></td>
<td>SPAWAR’s mission is the delivery of FORCNet and to provide the warfighter with knowledge superiority by developing, delivering, and maintaining effective, capable, and integrated command, control, communications, computer, intelligence, surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Yard’s diversity in tenant commands is the result of the Base Realignment and Closure Act of 2005 (BRAC) which, by congressional mandate, required the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces to consolidate facilities and operations across the United States and abroad in order to create a ‘leaner’ and less expensive military. This cost-saving legislation has had far-reaching implications nationally as many large and dispersed military bases and installations have had to shut down and consolidate with other regional defense establishments. As with any cost-saving measures, there are positive and negative effects to BRAC. In addition to saving the government money, BRAC has made the military more integrated and better connected, due to the closer physical proximity of the different services and their respective commands. The negative aspects of BRAC include the uprooting of economies from areas losing their military facilities and the ‘congestion’ associated
with concentrating organizations that were once accustomed to generous horizontal physical spaces. On the Washington Navy Yard, BRAC has manifested its positive and negative attributes. The Yard is a healthy and growing space for the US Navy's specialized technology, but is also becoming more crowded. These considerations make planning on the base a process that requires sensitivity, diplomacy, and creativity.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Adding to the mix of secure office space are the Yard’s numerous cultural and historical resources. These facilities include the Naval Historical Center (the Navy Museum and the soon to open Cold War Museum), the Navy Art Gallery, the USS Barry display ship, the Commandant’s House, Latrobe Gate, Admiral Leutze Park, and Admiral Willard Park [Figures 7-8].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navy Museum (Building 76)</td>
<td>Devoted to the display of naval artifacts, models, documents, and fine art, the museum chronicles the history of the United States Navy from the American Revolution to present day conflicts. Interactive exhibits commemorate the Navy’s wartime heroes and battles, as well as peacetime contributions in exploration, diplomacy, navigation, and humanitarian service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Library (Buildings 44 and 108)</td>
<td>The Library runs the length of the first floors of Buildings 44 and 108, which were constructed in 1890 and 1902, respectively, and was used initially as shops and laboratories for ordnance research. The main entrance to the Library is on Dahlgren Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Art Gallery (Building 67)</td>
<td>The Navy Art Collection contains depictions of naval ships, personnel, and action from all eras of US Naval history, but due to the operation of the Combat Art Program, the eras of World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, and Desert Shield/Storm are particularly well represented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS Barry</td>
<td>USS Barry was decommissioned on 5 November 1982 and began her new career as a permanent public display ship in 1984. Used for training and shipboard familiarization, and as a ceremonial platform, Barry is one of the most popular visitor destinations on the Washington Navy Yard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commandant's House (Building 1)</td>
<td>The Commandant’s House was once the sanctuary of President Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War. Its entrance is flanked by brass cannons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe Gate</td>
<td>What was once the main entrance to the Washington Navy Yard is now restricted to entry by residents of flag officers’ quarters and their authorized guests. Latrobe Gate also garners historical distinction as the oldest, continuously manned Marine sentry post in the nation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiral Leutze Park</td>
<td>The park is used as a parade ground and for formal affairs as the Ceremonial Quarterdeck of the Navy. Surrounding the park is a collection of historical bronze ordnance, captured as trophies of combat of United States forces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiral Willard Park</td>
<td>The park was named for Admiral Arthur Willard, commandant of the Navy Yard from 1927 to 1930. Willard Park is home to an array of naval artifacts from different eras. The majority is naval ordnance captured by the US Navy. Willard Park also provides visitors and employees with a small picnic area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VISITOR PROFILE

The Washington Navy Yard has the opportunity to attract a number of visitors that currently do not visit the base. In 2008, Washington, DC had 16.8 million visitors while only 292,654 visitors went to the Navy Museum. Additionally, the residents of the Washington, DC area include 4.4 million people within a 25-mile radius of the city. According to the 2000 Census, 41,578 DC area residents are part of the military. These large, untapped visitor populations provide enormous potential for raising the awareness of the cultural resources on the base, and attracting new visitors to support the recommendations presented in this report.

An outside consulting group, AECOM, conducted a report for the Washington Navy Yard. Their visitor profile showed that one of the attractions to the base is the 9am open time of the museum and outdoor eating locations. Based on this data, the recommendations presented in this proposal will provide additional amenities that will entice new visitors.

FIG 7. BASE CULTURAL RESOURCES

- 1. Balao
- 2. USS Barry
- 3. Man in the Sea Memorial
- 4. Cold War Museum
- 5. Winch House
- 6. Building 1
- 7. Navy Museum
- 8. Navy Art Gallery
- 9. Admiral Leutze Park
- 10. Building 58
- 11. Quarters B
- 12. Residence A
- 13. Latrobe Gate
- 14. Firehouse
FIG 8. BASE CULTURAL RESOURCES
Clockwise, L. to R.: Building 1, Admiral Willard Park, USS Barry, Man in the Sea Memorial, Cold War Museum, US Navy Museum
WAYFINDING, SIGNAGE, AND HERITAGE

In order to develop a series of recommendations for the Navy Yard’s wayfinding and signage program, a comprehensive review of the Navy Yard’s existing programs for signage, their conditions, and their utility was undertaken. This review was made in light of the current goal of improving access to and between the Navy Yard’s key cultural resources.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

As Figure 7 demonstrates, the majority of the base’s cultural resources are clustered at the center of the base. However, visitor entrances are not located near these resources. An initial reaction to this discovery is that the Latrobe Gate entrance cannot deliver guests, visitors, or employees immediately to the center of the base. Subject to base policy and the entrances that may be open at any given time, there must be a program in place to guide visitors as they enter the Yard’s circulation system.

In an effort to improve access to the cultural resources, a number of the following proposals address concerns relating to the public use of the Navy Yard, open spaces, and cultural resources. Recognizing the Navy’s financial limitations, a number of options for each area are provided.

In order to address the objective of improved access within the base, the first solution proposes a new, comprehensive wayfinding program that provides visitors with a clearly defined series of routes within the Navy Yard.

To improve visitor circulation and to ensure the safe and continued operation of the base, the proposed Prioritized Access to Heritage (PATH) system is a comprehensive signage program that will navigate visitors to points of interest while educating them about US Navy and Washington Navy Yard history.

The PATH system uses the wayfinding suggestions from the 1998 comprehensive plan as a starting point for its programming; however, it makes proposal considerations in light of security concerns in the post 9/11 era. Changes and additions have also been made to the plan set forth in the 1998 WNY comprehensive plan in order to adequately meet the needs of employees and visitors. This includes, but is not limited to, the dearth of signage, the recognition of important historical sites in the Navy Yard, and the general inclusion of sites not found in the 1998 system. The PATH system addresses these concerns.

A strong focus of the 1998 wayfinding system is the orientation of WNY employees. The PATH system suggests revised programming oriented towards both Navy Yard employees and visitors to the base. The PATH system will make provisions for a comprehensive signage system to guide visitors to the Navy Yard’s cultural resources while simultaneously educating visitors on Navy history and heritage.

METHODOLOGY

The PATH system was developed using techniques that determined the configuration, length, and placement of key components. A proximity analysis around the Navy Yard’s key cultural resources was conducted to determine the most direct paths between assets. This study was conducted with the use of GPS data points and GIS [Figure 9]. Using buffers around each resource, determinations
as to the location and heading of paths were made to be coterminous with existing physical paths and boundaries.

The resulting PATH system is indicated by the dashed line in Figure 9. The PATH system directs visitors to cultural assets within the base in the most efficient manner, reducing trip distance by eliminating passage through zones intended for employee and administrative operations.

PROGRAM DETAILS

Figure 10 illustrates the current placement of base location maps throughout the Navy Yard. Although the maps are located so as to guide visitors from the 6th Street Entrance and Visitors Entrance, their use for guiding visitors, guests, and employees through the base is hindered by their visual complexity and lack of proper direction to resources. Additionally, the locations of the current wayfinding signs do not correspond to the proposed PATH system.

In contrast, the PATH system adds a new wayfinding signage system located along the proposed circulation routes. The system effectively orient the users as to their position on the base and surrounding cultural resources, as well as guiding them through the base in the most efficient manner. This is illustrated in Figure 11.

The PATH system also assumes the responsibility of guiding guests, visitors, and employees from key entrances to the key circulation route. The Figure 12 demonstrates the scalability of the PATH system, in this instance integrating the 6th Street Entrance, the 11th street Entrance, and the Yards

FIG 9. PROXIMITY OF RESOURCES
Park Entrance to allow for visitor entry and exit to the PATH system. Because the implementation of the PATH system is incremental in nature, the scaling of the system can be adjusted to best correspond to base policy.

PROGRAM SUPPLEMENTS

In addition to improving access to cultural resources, the vision promotes the rich heritage of the Navy Yard through a meaningful interpretation of base history. Through inventory and analysis of the Yard’s history, resources, education programs, and visitor data, the need for a coordinated effort to increase awareness of the Navy Yard is apparent. To this end, a Cultural Resource Program (CRP) aims to enhance knowledge and increase visibility of the Navy Yard through improved branding and marketing. Within this program, visitors, employees, and the community benefit. (This program will be discussed in a following chapter in greater detail).

A primary function of the Cultural Resource Program is to create a Heritage Trail that will serve as a self-guided tour of the Navy Yard’s history and culture. As indicated in Figure 13, eight Heritage boards will be positioned throughout the Navy Yard. The Heritage boards will seek to address the rich heritage of the Navy Yard by informing visitors of the Yard’s past history along the PATH system. Heritage boards include historical information on specific buildings, sites, and events. Historical images will accompany the referenced material.
FIG 11. PROPOSED PATH INDICATOR LOCATIONS

FIG 12. PATH SYSTEM WITH CURRENT ENTRANCE POLICY
A secondary function of the Cultural Resource Program is to enforce the effectiveness of the PATH system through PATH POINTS (Points of Interest on Navy Trail), which are twelve-inch-diameter cast bronze medallions with raised graphics. They will be situated strategically between PATH wayfinding signage to ensure accurate navigation of the Navy Yard. The rendering in Figure 14 provides an example of how the PATH POINTS guide the visitor from one cultural resource to another, enforcing the effectiveness of the PATH system. Also illustrated, a PATH Heritage board provides complementary information about Navy Yard historic sites and events. In this case, a PATH Heritage board along the Riverwalk could inform visitors of the history by which the Anacostia became unsuitable for naval vessel production, due to the accumulation of silt in the mid-19th century.

Illustrated in figure 15, for further reference, is the integration of PATH POINTS into the PATH system. Their placement along the PATH system reinforces the effectiveness of the new pedestrian-friendly routes.

Features such as the PATH system, PATH Heritage boards, and PATH POINTS activate the Washington Navy Yard by creating a dynamic, user-friendly experience. These features also enforce base security while increasing visitor access. This is accomplished by increasing access to key points of interest while directing visitors away from sensitive base areas intended primarily for employees and operations.
FIG 14. HERITAGE BOARD AND PATH POINTS RENDERING

FIG 15. PROPOSED PATH POINTS LOCATION
PRECEDE.NTS

Successful and effective precedents were analyzed in the development of the PATH system. Locally, the Cultural Tourism DC Neighborhood Heritage Trail program features heritage boards, locator maps, and interactive elements such as audio tours [Figure 16]. This heritage trail program has met with incredible success, and thus, we suggest a partnership between Cultural Tourism DC and the proposed Washington Navy Yard PATH Heritage Trail. This formal, or informal, partnership would increase the connectivity in the community and support patronage to both trails. In order to meet the goal of integration, a productive step would be to parallel the high quality of existing visual and content standards in neighboring heritage trails.

The three-mile self-guided Freedom Trail in Boston is another precedent we examined when developing the PATH POINTS system. The trail incorporates on-ground wayfinding markers, including a continuous red brick path and bronze markers, leading visitors to sixteen historic sites [Figure 17]. The PATH POINTS system would similarly guide visitors to the bases’ key cultural resources while both enforcing the effectiveness of the PATH system and discouraging loitering, wandering, and lost visitors.

IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the PATH system may occur as part of a phased or graduated development program. Because the implementation of the PATH system is incremental in nature, the scaling of the system can be adjusted to best correspond to base policy.

FIG 16. CULTURAL TOURISM DC HERITAGE TRAIL
The initial implementation step is the development of signage for the PATH system, which corresponds to the key circulation route [figure 11]. The key circulation route allows for quick access between the cultural resources and services on the Navy Yard.

Determining the following steps in the development program for the PATH system is dependent upon base policy, relative to the permissible use of base entrances. Because the PATH system also assumes the responsibility of guiding guests, visitors, and employees from key entrances to the key circulation route under the PATH system, permissible entrances must be selected. Figure 12 demonstrates the scalability of the PATH system, in this instance integrating the 6th Street Entrance, the 11th street Entrance, as well as the Yards Park Entrance to allow for visitor entry and exit to the PATH system. Yet, any combination of these entrances can be used to allow access to the PATH system.

**FIG 17. BOSTON FREEDOM TRAIL**
COST

The PATH system can be priced either by its components or as a package. As previously discussed, the main cost is PATH wayfinding signage that directs visitors along the key circulation route within the base and from applicable base entrances. Supplemental program components are eight PATH Heritage boards as well as 50 PATH POINTS. The costs of these programs are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATH SYSTEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>UNIT TOTAL</th>
<th>INSTALLATION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>key circulation*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>74,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards Park feeder*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M St. feeder*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>34,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th St. feeder*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HERITAGE BOARD</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>UNIT TOTAL</th>
<th>INSTALLATION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATH POINTS</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>UNIT TOTAL</th>
<th>INSTALLATION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>12,250</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>27,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COST**  
200,050*

*Does not include an additional 10% for soft costs and contingency
CULTURAL RESOURCE PROGRAM

After conducting a preliminary inventory and analysis of the Yard’s physical historic resources, education and outreach programs, visitor access policy, visitor profile, and external representation of the Yard, a need to recommend a coordinated effort to increase awareness of the Navy Yard was identified. The Cultural Resource Program (CRP), an initiative that proposes this coordinated effort, enhances knowledge and increases visibility of the Navy Yard through improved interpretation, visual identity, and marketing.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The Washington Navy Yard embodies significant history, important both to the development of the United States Navy and the nation at large. The Yard was listed as a DC Historic District in 1964, a National Register Historic District in 1973, and a National Historic Landmark in 1976. The significance of this site is indisputable. However, due to the aforementioned accessibility issues facing the Navy Yard, visitor attendance to the base is limited and those visiting typically only go to the Navy Museum and USS Barry. Visitors overlook the other historic resources located on the base. These other resources, unlike the Navy Museum and the USS Barry, tell the multifaceted story of the Washington Navy Yard as well as that of the US Navy. The implementation of a new interpretation, branding, and marketing effort will more effectively convey the history of the Washington Navy Yard and increase the number of visitors, thereby further promoting the US Navy.

The following inventory of existing conditions identifies significant cultural resources located at the Navy Yard, which should be interpreted for visitors, as well as current efforts on base to promote the heritage of the Washington Navy Yard.

Physical Historic Resources

As mentioned in the preceding description of the PATH system, the cultural resources at the Washington Navy Yard are clustered in close proximity to one another. However, a lack of effective signage, interpretive tools, and clear walking routes prevents visitors from taking full advantage of the history embedded in the Yard.

After conducting research on the historic resources at the Yard, as well as looking at existing security policy, the following list of sites on base represents high priority to access resources, the interpretation of which needs to be included in all Washington Navy Yard history educational materials going forth. All of the following sites are located along the PATH system.

1. Latrobe Gate
2. Navy Museum
3. USS Barry
4. Admiral Leutze Park
5. Dudley Knox Center for Naval History
6. Office Quarters A & B
7. Washington Navy Yard Chapel
8. Commandant’s House
9. Winch House
10. Dahlgren Park
11. Navy Art Gallery
12. Cold War Museum
Education on Base

There are numerous education programs and public events that are currently in place at the Washington Navy Yard, in addition to two major cultural institutions. These educational programs take place at the Navy Yard's cultural centers such as the Navy Museum, Navy Art Gallery, and the USS Barry. However, after examining these programs, events, and other educational activities, it is evident that there are no programs that explicitly focus on the base's history. The following is a brief example of existing educational programs that have not highlighted the history of the Washington Navy Yard. An additional lack of direct outreach to the surrounding community through public programming and the events now offered limits their impact. Existing programs are not effectively publicized, and thus, are missing out on key demographics.

The Navy Museum’s nine permanent exhibits tell the history of the US Navy leading up to the Korean War. These exhibitions do not explicitly emphasize the history of the Washington Navy Yard. In addition to providing and maintaining these exhibits, the Museum also hosts book signings, lectures, and concerts by the US Navy Band two to three times a week. Together with the NHHC, the Navy Museum offers educational materials to teachers. These materials are used in different ways: either to accompany a visit to the Navy Museum or to teach Navy history in the classroom (“Field Trip in Box” program). The content of these materials focuses on Navy technology (DIVE! DIVE!), the history of shipbuilding (Ships to the Sea), the life of sailors (Hats Off!), and the history of US exploration (To the Ends of the Earth and Beyond). The history of the Navy Yard itself is not included in these materials. A new homeschooling at the Museum program has been incredibly popular. However, even this programming does not educate children about the history of the Navy Yard.

While the Navy Museum also offers a series of pamphlets regarding its exhibits, as well as thematic brochures on different histories of the Navy, none of these publications demonstrate a consistent brand image.

Visitor Profile & Visitor Access

As previously stated, the Washington Navy Yard has the opportunity to attract a number of visitors that currently do not visit the base. In 2008, Washington, DC was visited by 16.8 million people, while only 292,654 visitors went to the Navy Museum. Further, the Navy Museum faced a significant drop in attendance in 2009, with only 153,255 visitors attending. In 2008, based on the result of 2,000 visitor surveys, it was shown that 36% of visitors to the Navy Museum were from the DC area, 64% of visitors carried Department of Defense ID cards, and nearly 70% of visitors were over the age of 40. These numbers indicate that there is a need to attract people outside of the DC area, as well as those under the age of 40 and not part of a school trip. This large number of untapped visitors provides enormous potential for raising the awareness of the cultural resources on the base and bringing new visitors to support the recommendations presented in this report.

In general, visitor access policy is inconsistent and difficult to navigate. There are currently different protocols to enter the Riverwalk, the USS Barry, the Navy Museum, and the base, and these vary further on weekends. This process is generally uninviting and complicated for potential visitors. Clear instructions presented in a welcoming manner would further encourage individuals and families to visit the Yard.
External Representation

One major accessibility issue that the Washington Navy Yard faces is difficulty accessing information about the Navy Yard, what exists at the Navy Yard, and how to physically access the Navy Yard. Without representation on external Washington, DC tourism websites, visitors who are not specifically looking to visit the Navy Yard and go to the NHHC website will not know how to do so. The following is a list of the most popular DC tourism websites and how the Washington Navy Yard is currently represented on them.

Washington.org

This site is the official tourism website for Washington, DC, hosted by Destination DC, a nonprofit corporation that acts as “the lead organization to successfully manage and market Washington, DC as a premier global convention, tourism and special events destination, with a special emphasis on the arts, cultural and historical communities.”

The Washington Navy Yard is represented solely by the Navy Museum. The description is as follows:

“Housed in the old Naval Gun Factory, the museum’s collection features the foremost fighting top from the USS Constitution, the bathyscaphe Trieste, ship models, medals, uniforms, photographs and fine art. Hands-on and great for kids - including working submarine periscopes and WWII gun mounts. Open Mon. - Fri. 9 am - 5 pm, weekends and holidays 10 am - 5 pm. Free admission. Free parking on weekends. Visitors over 16 years of age should bring valid photo ID (ex: driver's license) to gain entry to the Washington Navy Yard. PLEASE NOTE: ACCESS TO DISPLAY SHIP BARRY IS NOW RESTRICTED BY NEW WNY SECURITY POLICIES. PLEASE CALL FOR DETAILS ON VISITING BARRY.”

Regardless of the fact that the Washington Navy Yard is not mentioned as a major historic site in Washington, DC, the featured text does not aptly describe the significant assets of the Navy Museum. Further, the text in capital letters is hostile and unwelcoming.

Culturaltourismdc.org

Cultural Tourism DC (CTDC) is a nonprofit organization that implements a number of successful programs that highlight the cultural heritage of Washington, DC. CTDC’s programs are award winning, and the website provides suggestions of sites to visit for DC visitors.

The Washington Navy Yard is represented on the CTDC through a few news articles about one-day events at the base, and is mentioned in a description of one of its heritage trails that ends at Latrobe Gate. The Navy Museum is described as follows:

“The Naval History & Heritage Command is the official history program of the Department of the Navy. Its lineage dates back to 1800 with the founding of the Navy Department Library by President John Adams. The Command now includes a museum, art gallery, research library, archives, underwater archaeology and curator as well as research and writing programs. The Command’s origins form a rich history in themselves.

Because of its role as a site to inform visitors about Washington, DC’s cultural institutions, it is of particular importance that the Washington Navy Yard be better represented and recommended as a site to visit.
The District.com

The District is a comprehensive tourists’ guide to Washington, DC. Neither the Washington Navy Yard nor the Navy Museum are mentioned on this website.

PRECEDENTS

The existing conditions inventory and analysis demonstrates that there are significant opportunities to improve and increase the Washington Navy Yard’s visibility as a major historical resource in DC, as well as the nation. In order to capitalize on these opportunities, an organized heritage tourism program needs to be implemented. Before developing the framework for the Cultural Resource Program, a number of cultural tourism methods and successfully implemented programs were consulted.

One source of information was “Share Your Heritage: Cultural Heritage Tourism Success Stories” prepared by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, which outlines the “Five Principles of Successful and Sustainable Cultural Heritage Tourism” and the “Four Steps for Getting Started in Cultural Heritage Tourism.” These are provided below:

**Five Principles of Successful and Sustainable Cultural Heritage Tourism**

1. Collaborate
2. Find the Fit Between the Community and Tourism
3. Make Sites and Programs Come Alive
4. Focus on Quality and Authenticity
5. Preserve and Protect Resources

**Four Steps for Getting Started in Cultural Heritage Tourism**

1. Assess the potential
2. Plan and organize
3. Prepare for visitors, protect and manage your cultural, historic, and natural resources
4. Market for success

Numerous historic sites, towns, and cities, to best coordinate efforts and provide visitors with the most authentic experience of present historic resources, have utilized these principles and steps.
Based on the applicability of these principles and steps to the needs of the Washington Navy Yard, a new, straightforward framework has been created for the Cultural Resource Program:

1. Interpret
2. Brand
3. Promote and Market

Each of these steps requires a collaborative effort between internal and external agencies in order to maintain authenticity and quality of historical interpretation of sites, create a unique brand that can be applied to all print and website publications and Navy materials, and to effectively promote and market the Washington Navy Yard through its interpretation and new branding and image.

Interpret and Brand: Heritage Trail

The catalyst project for the CRP is the implementation of the Washington Navy Yard Heritage Trail and PATH POINT system, which is explained in detail in the preceding section. A Washington Navy Yard Museum was proposed in the 1998 Master Plan. This heritage trail will fill that role. This project will interpret the Navy Yard’s history in a new and innovative way, while providing visitors with a new reason to visit the Navy Yard. This heritage trail will carry a new Navy Yard brand, and will be promoted to external agencies. This model should be applied to all other interpretive efforts that evolve out of the CRP.

The Heritage Trail will serve as the new icon of the base: it will be both a tangible and an intangible invitation to visitors, an incentive to visit the base, a clear pathway around the base, and an invaluable educational tool. It ultimately provides visitors with a unique pedestrian experience, while linking existing resources to historical themes and stories.

Interpret and Brand: Heritage Trail Supplements

After the implementation of the Heritage Trail, interactive products can be designed and created to enhance the experience on the Heritage Trail. These products can include an iPhone application, SMS-based scavenger hunts, QR codes, audio tours dictated by Navy historians, and downloadable maps and brochures with additional information. Further, educational programs for students and adults alike can be planned and programmed around the Heritage Trail: students could be led by Museum staff or volunteers discussing the general history of the Navy Yard, while more detailed, thematic tours could be designed for adults.

Interpret and Promote: Additional Branding

Although the Heritage Trail and supplemental programs and products are truly the first step in transforming the Washington Navy Yard into a world-class cultural resource, the following is a list of other programs that should be considered for development and implementation:

1. Boat Tours on Anacostia River
2. Visiting Vessel Program
3. "A Day in the Life of...": a series of events that recreate social life at different time periods on the Navy Yard, including ice cream socials, dances, and period concerts
It is of high priority that the surrounding community be marketed to as a primary market for these events.

Brand and Promote: External Partnerships

In order to effectively promote the Washington Navy Yard as a new heritage brand, it is imperative to create partnerships with key, influential organizations. The following are potential collaborative partners to successfully market the Navy Yard and its history:

National Park Service


DC Preservation League

The Washington Navy Yard could be featured in its lecture and tour program.

Cultural Tourism DC

CTDC would act as consultants during the creation and development of the Washington Navy Yard Heritage Trail and thus, would become part of their successful Neighborhood Heritage Trail program. Additional exposure through CTDC would be beneficial to the Navy Yard. This includes providing CTDC with upcoming events, educational materials, and news from the WNY.

Destination DC

By providing additional data to Destination DC, as well as images and educational materials, visitorship to the Navy Yard could increase.

COSTS

In addition to the cost of the Heritage Trail, costs associated with the CRP are based on the programs that the NHHC and Navy Museum decide to develop. Pricing for graphic design work, iPhone application development, or event planning, for example, will vary based on project, program, and scope.
WASHINGTON NAVY YARD RIVERWALK

Work on the Riverwalk proposal began in response to NAVFAC’s initial prompt that the Riverwalk would open in the near future. An initial assessment of the areas around the Riverwalk in this context found that the Riverwalk was in good physical condition but inaccessible and disconnected from all nearby cultural resources except the USS Barry [Figure 18]. The effect this has on the image of the Navy, though not empirically measured, is negative and reinforces an image of the Navy Yard as isolated from neighbors and the city.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing Riverwalk is a pleasant space to walk; it is well designed and provides efficient access to the USS Barry. For this reason recommendations for the Riverwalk are mostly programmatic. The proposed physical changes focus on the areas directly north of the existing Riverwalk, where a number of opportunities exist to create improved access to nearby cultural resources.

The western gate and eastern gate by 11th street are open during working hours (8am-5pm) Monday-Friday, excluding Federal Holidays. Exceptions to these operating hours will be made when restricted access is necessary to accomplish Navy operations. The Navy may block or restrict access without notice for safety or operational reasons. It would be beneficial for the Navy and the community for the Navy to continue investigating ways to increase hours of accessibility as Navy employees and neighboring Department of Transportation (DOT) employees frequent the Riverwalk throughout the day.

FIG 18. AERIAL OF RIVERWALK
While the above considerations deal with the access to and experience along the Navy Yard’s portion of the Anacostia riverfront, they do not deal with access to the base from the Riverwalk. Currently, employees may swipe their security passes at turnstiles along the Riverwalk. Such security measures are effective as they allow employees to enter the Yard from the Riverwalk during business hours. Since the base is not accessible to visitors from this area, it poses a public access issue. Visitors walking from Yards Park and wishing to enter the Navy Yard to see the relics in Admiral Willard Park, the Navy Museum, and other cultural resources on the Navy Yard will find they must walk almost the entire perimeter of the base to enter at the visitor station located on the eastern edge of the Yard.

The proposed alterations to the Riverwalk recommend that the creation of a visitor entrance on the Riverwalk be located at the gate that currently provides visitor access on weekdays. Should the above be done, visitors (and employees) will have improved access to the Yard from the Riverwalk. Unfortunately, once through this gate at the Riverwalk visitors and employees are faced with an expansive surface parking lot that acts as a psychological barrier. (During the development of these proposals, access to the Riverwalk changed. In early April the Navy Yard implemented a new policy that opened the Riverwalk to the public during operating workday hours.)

Figure 19 demonstrates how important assets like the Navy Museum and Admiral Willard Park are separated from the Riverwalk.

FIG 19. AREA NORTH OF USS BARRY
In order to develop a series of recommendations for the Navy Yard’s wayfinding and signage program, a comprehensive review must be made of the Navy Yard’s existing programs for signage, their conditions, and their utility. This review must also be made in light of the project goal of improving access to and between the Navy Yard’s key cultural resources.

As the map (Figure 9) of cultural resource clusters show in the discussion of the proposed PATH system, the majority of the base’s cultural resources are clustered at the center of the base and are best accessed from the Riverwalk’s existing gate opposite the USS Barry.

In addition to the physical constraints to best use the Riverwalk, there is a noticeable lack of programmed activities along the Riverwalk to attract employees and visitors to use it more regularly. One of the few draws to the Riverwalk, and easily one of the most recognizable symbols of the Navy Yard, is the decommissioned USS Barry. While the recent opening of the walk during business hours improves access to the USS Barry, there is little else to do along the walk once there. Additionally, on weekends visitors to the Navy Yard are still limited as to their points of access, specifically the entrance on M Street.

METHODOLOGY

The proposed alterations detailed below were informed by a number of precedents. Two places that most informed the proposal were Fountain Park in Bremerton, WA and Baltimore’s Inner Harbor. These are both good examples of waterfronts that incorporate new parkland and open plaza space. Each of these precedents served as both spatial and aesthetic inspiration for this proposal.

The proposed gateway and plaza to the north of the USS Barry aligns with goals found in both the 1979, 1990, and 1998 master plans for the Navy Yard. As part of the process to envision how the Riverwalk can better accommodate visitors the impact of nearby developments and their occupants and visitors was assessed. Two major developments leading to an increased desire for access to the Navy Yard’s Riverwalk are the Yards Park and Nationals Park. Yards Park is a project of Forest City Development. The park opened in August 2010 and consists of 42 acres along the Anacostia River. The park was built through a public/private partnership between Forest City and GSA and is managed by the Capitol Riverfront BID.

Yards Park is part of a larger development by the BID that will blend adaptive reuse of historical industrial buildings with construction on new sites. The activities planned for the park include concerts, a café, a farmers’ market, and a trapeze school. This new park and its programmed activities are part of a larger initiative by DC to create an accessible and active riverfront for its residents and visitors. The Navy Yard’s Riverwalk is integral to the success of the city’s initiative. More importantly, the Navy can capitalize on these new policy and business initiatives to create a greater Navy presence along the Anacostia and in DC, which will lead to greater public awareness of the Navy and its purpose, potentially leading to improved recruitment.
PROPOSAL DETAILS

In order to address the objective of better connecting the existing cultural resources found at the Navy Museum and Admiral Willard Park, as well as future cultural resources such as the Cold War Museum and the Man in the Sea Memorial, the first phase of the Riverwalk proposal creates a more direct and safe path from the USS Barry portion of the Riverwalk to the Navy Museum. Also, the relics found in Admiral Willard Park become more accessible to those walking along the riverfront. The ideal solution proposes a larger plaza space for the introduction of food options for visitors and employees alike, as well as providing space for larger educational gatherings and community-programmed activities [Figures 20-21].

Figure 23 shows the ideal reconfiguration of the current spaces obstructing connections between cultural resources along the Riverwalk. Creating this space requires a number of physical alterations to the existing conditions. In order to construct 30,000 square feet of plaza and 21,000 square feet of new park land, 150 parking spaces will be moved. The new plaza is shown in red, the moved parking is shown in dark grey, and new park space is dark green. The existing conditions are shown in lighter shades.

Looking north from the Riverwalk’s entrance to the Navy Yard, Figure 21 shows how the proposal will create a new space that accommodates additional food options, seating, new park space, and creates clear access to the relic park. This new plaza offers the flexibility for more employee events and recreational activities, while creating a bridge between the Navy Yard and the community.

FIG 20. AREA OF FOCUS : BEFORE

FIG 21. AREA OF FOCUS : AFTER
Creating a new plaza and more parkland is important. However, it is more important to create links for visitors between the Riverwalk and the cultural assets of the Navy Yard, including the Navy Museum and Admiral Willard Park. Figure 25 shows the proposal for Option 2 of the new Riverwalk. Because the primary goal for this intervention is to better connect the Riverwalk to the Navy Museum and Admiral Willard Park, Option 2 is a good first step toward the ideal proposal. While Option 2 does not create as much plaza space, nor secure as strong a connection between the identified cultural resources, as the ideal reconfiguration, it will still improve access to the Navy Museum, the Commandant’s house, and relics in Admiral Willard Park.

In addition to these physical alterations, the Navy Yard should also implement support for new programs that increase activity along the waterfront, and better connect visitors to the Yard’s history and heritage. New landscape features and additional benches will help transform the Riverwalk into a place where people will enjoy the riverfront and their access to the Navy Yard’s rich history. With the proposed physical changes to the parking area and Admiral Willard Park, as well as the new
PATH system and heritage boards, the Riverwalk will become a destination for employees, visitors to DC, and the community.

In addition to the physical changes and programming, it is recommended that the Navy Yard strongly consider transforming the waterfront into a 24/7 space that benefits the community and visitors. As outlined in the subsequent food section of this report, it is proposed that the Navy Yard work towards the realization of a waterfront restaurant outside of the Riverwalk’s western gate to attract the community to the water and the Yard after hours [Figure 26]. Because it is off Navy Yard property, this restaurant will require the collaboration of the Navy with others, like the Capitol Riverfront BID.
THE IDEAL: A NEW GATEWAY FOR THE NAVY YARD:

The main goal of the ideal proposal is to best create a more inviting Riverwalk that is convenient for both employees and visitors, make the entrance from the Yards Park the main visitor entrance and an employee entrance, and better direct people to the base’s primary cultural resources: the USS Barry and the Naval Museum.

The proposed plan creates an open plaza between the museum and the USS Barry by relocating parking spaces, introducing semi-permanent structures for food vendors, adding new moveable tables and chairs, relocating naval relics from Admiral Willard Park to a new promenade park adjacent to the Riverwalk, and introducing signage to highlight cultural resources.

FIG 26. LOCATION FOR PROPOSED RESTAURANT
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PRECEDEENTS

When considering how the proposed spaces along the Riverwalk should look and function, a number of precedents in the United States were examined. Of these, two primary precedents were selected as ideal for more detailed analysis [Figure 27].

The first of these is the Inner Harbor in Baltimore, MD. The Baltimore Inner Harbor provides a diversity of activities that not only brings people to the waterfront, but also interacts with the water through boats and other activities. The proximity of attractions within walking distance and parking are important factors in its success. There is a water taxi that provides transportation to other parts of Baltimore. The Inner Harbor successfully pairs open space with amenities and programs that attract visitors and city residents to the waterfront.

The second primary precedent was Fountain Park in Bremerton, WA. Fountain Park is a new riverside park developed by the city of Bremerton adjacent to a former Navy Yard. The park connects a naval museum and a decommissioned ship through the use of successful urban design and unique fountains and monuments commemorating the shipbuilding legacy of the yard. In many ways similar to aspects of the Navy Yard’s 1998 master plan, Bremerton went through a redevelopment plan incorporating many mixed-use buildings. While these elements of the Washington Navy Yard 1998 master plan were put aside after the events of September 11, the investment of private and public funds into the area surrounding the Navy Yard are comparable to the new development in Bremerton. Today, Fountain Park is seen as the “crown jewel” of new developments within the city. Should the Navy Yard implement recommendations to reconfigure their portion of the Riverwalk while making it accessible to the public, they, too, can become a crown jewel in their part of DC.

FIG 27.RIVERWALK PRECEDENTS

![FOUNTAIN PARK, BREMERTON, WA](image1)
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IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the above recommendations for the reconfiguration of the Riverwalk will require significant capital investment. For certain aspects of the Riverwalk, such as opening it to 24/7 access and the construction of a new restaurant on land outside the Navy Yard’s western gate, the Navy should explore possible partnerships with the Capital Riverfront BID. Finally, the Navy should hire either internal or external designers to develop detailed drawings and cost estimates for implementation.

COST

Recommendations are phased in order to best accommodate the Navy’s need for incremental improvements. There are two main phases for improvements, both are programmatic and show the potential for improved access. As proposed, each of the main phases can be broken down into smaller components and implemented over time rather than in one comprehensive project. The costs associated with these proposals are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 1</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>UNIT TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new parking</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new plaza (sq. ft)</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demolition parking (sq. ft)</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>283,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demolition trees (4-8’)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demolition trees (&gt;8’)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benches</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chairs</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tables</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planting (acre)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>150,00</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trees</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod (sq. ft)</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>132,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relic movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trash receptacles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,713,000</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 2</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>UNIT TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new parking (sq. ft)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new plaza (sq. ft)</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demolition parking (sq. ft)</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demolition trees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planting (acre)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>150,00</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$748,000</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include an additional 10% for soft costs and contingency
West Leutze Park is centrally located on the Washington Navy Yard. It separates the daily functions of Town Center from the ceremonial aspects of the central parade ground of Leutze Park. It is a space without a use. Increases in Navy population, enhanced food options, and additional visitors to the Navy Yard require that consideration to underutilized open space such as West Leutze Park be addressed.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

In its current configuration, West Leutze Park is unusable by Navy employees and visitors. This is true for two main reasons. First, West Leutze Park has a noticeable change in elevation, sloping downward toward Building 22 (Town Center) from Leutze Park. Second, a more significant barrier to accessing West Leutze Park is the retaining wall along the park’s western edge directly opposite Town Center. This retaining wall is a considerable obstacle for users of this space. West Leutze Park is landscaped, however placement of trees appears random.

PRECEDENTS

A number of parks and open spaces have informed the proposals for West Leutze Park; specifically, parks and plazas that exploit changes in elevation either through the use of stairs or through terracing and the creation of amphitheaters. The most relevant precedents include Pioneer Courthouse Square in Portland, Oregon; Scott Outdoor Amphitheater in Swarthmore, Pennsylvania; the Spanish Steps in Rome, Italy; and Washington Navy Yard 1998 Master Plan [Figure 29].

FIG 28.WEST LEUTZE PARK FACING TOWN CENTER
Scott Outdoor Amphitheater is a prime example of the integration of a terraced amphitheater park in a natural setting. This space provides useful ideas for landscaping, as it integrates the existing trees into the terraced park. Similar to Scott Outdoor Amphitheater, Pioneer Courthouse Square provides additional hardscaping that creates an urban plaza.

The Spanish Steps offers insight into how to integrate critical spaces at different elevations. This is important as we consider how to integrate the ceremonial spaces of Leutze Park with the daily functions of Town Center.

Finally, the 1998 Master Plan identified the importance of connecting Leutze Park and Town Center through West Leutze Park. In the 1998 plan, West Leutze Park was converted into office space, however a new staircase connecting Leutze Park and Town Center was proposed. Additionally, a circular amphitheater was proposed in the same plan.

PROPOSAL

The most significant change for West Leutze Park is to make it readily accessible by removing the existing retaining wall that acts as a barrier to entry from the Town Center side of the park. Utilizing the Park’s change in elevation, a terraced amphitheater with a plaza at the western end of the park will be created [Figure 30].

FIG 29.WEST LEUTZE PARK PRECEDENTS (L. TO R.): SCOTT OUTDOOR AMPHITHEATER, PIONEER COURTHOUSE, SPANISH STEPS.
Adding tables and chairs will encourage outdoor eating. The construction of a staircase will connect the daily functions of Town Center with the more ceremonial functions of Leutze Park to the east. When completed, these changes will create a true Town Center.

Drawing from precedents, the re-configured West Leutze Park will have a natural appearance similar to that of Scott Outdoor Amphitheater that allows for a variety of uses. The new West Leutze Park provides spaces for both passive and active enjoyment. More significant than the new landscaping and terracing is the staircase at the center of the new park which will improve flow around the Yard and connect the western and eastern portions of the Navy Yard.

IMPLEMENTATION

The US Navy has a need for proposals that are phased and can be implemented incrementally, but also achieve its specific goal. The US Navy can slowly implement the full proposal starting with the construction of stairs, which solves the critical problem of improving access on the Navy Yard [Figure 31]. With these new stairs, anyone can enter, walk around, sit, or simply pass through on their way to other parts of the Yard. Additionally, the placement of the new stairs directly across from the Town Center’s entrance frames a new gathering space on the Navy Yard. As funding becomes available, additional enhancements can be made to West Leutze Park.

COSTS

The overall cost of the West Leutze Park re-configuration is $310,500. This includes the cost of landscaping, soil removal, the creation of stairs, terracing, tree removal, and tree installation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 1</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>UNIT TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>demolition wall (cf)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demolition trees</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grading (cy)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>$.25</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new stairs (paved sq. ft)</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$38,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new terraces (paved sq. ft)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new terrace (grass sq. ft)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soil removal (cy)</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tables</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chairs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COST** $310,500*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 2</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>UNIT TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>demolition wall (cf)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demolition trees</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new stairs (paved sq. ft)</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soil removal (cy)</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COST** $47,500*

*Does not include an additional 10% for soft costs and contingency
BUILDING 33

Like a number of other spaces on the Navy Yard, Building 33 is a large open space that does not maximize its potential. Its proximity to Town Center and West Leutze Park offers significant opportunities to accommodate additional visitors and employees.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Building 33 has a large courtyard with the potential to be a lively gathering space. Currently, it features poorly arranged seating and a lack of properly-programmed activities.

PRECEDE NT S

Bryant Park in New York City has attracted many mid-day visitors looking for a place to sit and read or eat. The Washington Navy Yard has moveable tables and chairs in other courtyards that could easily be replicated in Building 33.

PROPOSAL

Building 33’s courtyard can be used to accommodate the added number of diners drawn to Town Center. Adding movable tables and chairs allows for flexibility in seating. This is a simple solution to an inactive space which provides yet another alternative for individuals to meet and interact. Additionally, programming like mobile food vendors or concerts can be incorporated.

IMPLEMENTATION

The addition of tables and chairs is an inexpensive solution that can be implemented quickly. Further programming can be determined through employee input.

FIG 32.BUILDING 33 COURTYARD PROPOSAL
FOOD OPTIONS

Employees of the Washington Navy Yard have expressed a desire for more, and healthier, food options. Taking into consideration the current and projected employee and visitor population growth, this plan proposes flexible and cost-effective solutions to accommodate upcoming changes. Existing conditions on and off base were analyzed to determine ideal locations and types of food retail.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The current food options for employees are concentrated within Building 22 (Town Center), which contains fast food, a NEX convenience store, and seating for employees. Other employee options are located within Building 184 (Subway and Dunkin’ Donuts), Building 123 (William III), and Building 36 (William III) [Figure 33]. Furthermore, Mordecai Booth pub is located in Building 101, but only opens in the late afternoon (it also offers off-site catering). Overall, the existing clustering of food options creates high population areas that lack easy access to food, such as the northeast corner. In addition, employees are not satisfied with the current food selection; they want healthier options made available to them.

A growing amount of food retail is available outside of the installation [Figure 34]. There are a small number of establishments on M Street, and more restaurants on 8th Street. However, recommending that Navy Yard employees utilize these options is insufficient. Due to Navy Yard policy, employees get only 30 minutes for lunch; walking to and from many of these restaurants could take up the entire

FIG 33. CURRENT FOOD OPTIONS
lunch period. Furthermore, some of the restaurants on 8th Street offer delivery service, which is clearly not meeting the employee demand based on employee feedback. Finally, the employee and visitor populations will continue to increase. Introducing new visitors and more employees on base will place greater demands on existing food vendors, and adding food options on the installation will accommodate the growth.

PRECEDE NENTS

Many other cities have used creative ways to address food issues and encourage entrepreneurship. For example, cities across the nation have embraced the mobile food truck and cart trend. Washington, DC is no exception as it offers over thirty food trucks with a wide variety of food options. Food is prepared within the truck and then served out of it. The trucks move around the city but are easily tracked online. They are quite popular and attract many people, often resulting in long lines. According to a recent article in *The Washington Post*, they even do reasonably well in the winter.

In addition to trucks, food carts are growing in popularity in Washington, DC. Food carts tend to have their regular spots around town and are more stationary, while trucks travel more. Carts are offering an increasing variety of food options. Standard hot dog carts are partnering with other food vendors to offer different types of food. DC Central Kitchen runs its own Capitol Carts using graduates from its program. Furthermore, vendors are opening their own specialty carts that offer pizza or burritos, for example. Both food trucks and carts are good options when flexibility in demand and affordability is desired. Another structure used to provide food is a stationary kiosk, which comes in many forms found throughout the world. A great example of a kiosk is the type found at Bryant

FIG 34. FOOD OPTIONS OFF BASE
Park in New York City. These are more permanent structures that host interchangeable vendors. The kiosks also offer seasonal protection and in the warmer weather can be surrounded by tables and chairs. Some parks have used concession revenue and sponsorship funds to pay for construction and operation. While the Navy Yard should not expect to make as much as large parks, it should not be entirely discounted if financial assistance is desired.

PROPOSAL

Offering more, and healthier, food on the installation has many benefits. It can increase employee morale and base readiness, as well as accommodate a growing number of employees and visitors. In order to provide demand flexibility and sensitivity regarding budgetary matters, a number of recommendations will be offered. The different types of suggestions can be used alone to gauge effectiveness or in combination with one another. The Navy Yard and vendors will have to determine which combination works best for everyone.

The suggestions in Figure 35 include both stationary and mobile solutions, and accommodate employees in the northeast corner of the base because they have a lack of close food options. The Riverwalk is also an ideal location because it would best serve employees and visitors. Mobile solutions can be opened quickly and do not compete for space with more mission critical functions, while stationary solutions offer stability.
To institute mobile options, either contact individual food trucks or the newly formed DC Mobile Food Vendors Association to arrange for the arrival of food trucks to the installation. There are multiple ideal areas where food trucks can park. One area is between the Washington Navy Yard and the Department of Transportation. The Yards Park area would accommodate long lines and provide space for eating. It should also generate much business for vendors, which could be a good way to attract them to the area. If vendors agreed to security conditions and short-term leases, there are also many attractive options on the installation. One great example is the southeast parking lot. There, a parking space could be designated for a truck and people could line up in the lot, while being close to the waterfront. The Riverwalk is another potential area as long as there is enough space for the truck and line of customers. Finally, there are many corridors throughout the base that could support a food truck, especially the area between Building 22 and Building 23.

Food carts are smaller and could fit in even more spaces on the installation than trucks. Furthermore, they do not necessarily need designated parking spaces. In addition to the areas mentioned for the food trucks, a cart could work well on the large, sunny corner of 10th Street and Beatty Place. A cart might also be good in the parking area between Building 157 and Building 169. If the Eberle Place corridor were landscaped similarly to others on base, a cart would fit well there, too. While those suggestions are weighted towards the northeast, there are other attractive options, such as the area by parking garage 386 and Building 126 (Visitor’s Center) and the Riverwalk. There are many food cart vendors that the Yard could contact to arrange times for them to be on the installation.
Stationary

A food kiosk, like the example shown from Bryant Park [Figure 37], would be a wonderful addition to the Riverwalk area. The structure could remain in place throughout the year and the Yard could choose any vendor to operate out of it. If there was interest in working with Barracks Row Main Street, the Yard could connect with restaurant owners on 8th Street who could use the kiosk as a satellite location. However, any preferred vendor could operate in a kiosk. The structure offers more seasonal protection than carts, and could be a great resource for employees and visitors to the installation and Riverwalk. If the cost seemed prohibitive, the Navy Yard might consider using concession revenue or sponsorships to make the project more feasible.

The addition of coffee and snack stands to select building lobbies could be an easy and quick food resource for employees. There are many different types and sizes of coffee/snack stands from which to choose. The Navy Yard could use a vendor or catering services on base to stock it. In addition, a staff member would have to be hired to maintain and operate it. However, the addition of stands in select building lobbies could be a great way to offer breakfast foods, healthier snacks, and coffee so that employees will not have to wait in long lines or walk far to the Dunkin’ Donuts or William III locations. Ideal locations for stands include the lobbies of Building 33 and Building 101.

Modifications to Building 22 (Town Center) could further help satisfy needs of employees for more and healthier food. Existing jewelry vendors can be relocated from the seating area and the stands used as Grab and Go stations. These stations could offer pre-made food from catering or any other

FIG 37. STATIONARY FOOD OPTIONS

SNACK STAND  BRYANT PARK FOOD KIOSK
food vendor. In addition, the area by the stands could also fit a soup and salad bar, which could be a relatively fast way to introduce a new and healthier vendor. Finally, the current vendors’ contracts should be evaluated so that changes can be made, if needed, when their contracts expire.

Mordecai Booth pub currently does not open until late afternoon. Another suggestion is for Mordecai to open for lunch and offer pre-made sandwiches and salads, for example. They could offer whatever their facilities currently support and do it through catering or by working with another vendor. If Mordecai Booth opened for lunch, it would offer an additional indoor seating area, as well. This could be good for the cool winter and the hot summer and be an alternative to outdoor-centered carts and trucks.

The addition of a new restaurant would be an opportunity to connect with the larger community, as well as address employee and visitor concerns. Putting a restaurant in the area by the power plant would be convenient for employees and allow the community to access it at night. Furthermore, a new restaurant could be configured to accommodate a permanent, separate Officers Club, if desired. Restaurants with waterfront access and views are popular. A partnership with the Capitol Riverfront BID could facilitate construction and operation.

IMPLEMENTATION

To identify ideal new vendors, the Navy Exchange (NEX) should use the results from their upcoming survey of all employees on base. It has already been expressed that employees would like healthier options, but the survey would provide even more detailed feedback. This will not only help with new vendors and food types, but also with replacement of current vendors when their contracts expire. Because NEX already offers various contract types, they could offer short-term contracts to mobile vendors and longer term contracts to stationary vendors, for example.

COSTS

With regards to mobile food trucks and carts, the vendors are largely responsible for the operational costs, while the Navy Yard would be responsible for any necessary utility hook-ups. Below are cost estimates for the stationary kiosk, building lobby stand, Grab and Go stands, and a salad/soup bar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>UNIT TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coffee cart</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grab and go</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiosk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salad bar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COST** 309,000*

*Does not include an additional 10% for soft costs and contingency
PARTNERSHIPS

Strategic partnerships will further advance the implementation of the proposals presented in this report. The CPLO of the Washington Navy Yard should be responsible for managing these partnerships with outside groups and institutions.

IMPROVED WAYFINDING

The partnerships for implementing an improved wayfinding program include:

Capitol Riverfront BID

A partnership should be established with the BID to ensure that any Navy-instituted signage outside of the base, as well as current BID signage, is coordinated. The Navy Yard should hold meetings with the community to provide input into the new PATH system and its design. In addition, a relationship with the BID to promote community visitorship to the Navy Yard and its new heritage trail could be accomplished through marketing and signage implemented by the BID.

Cultural Tourism DC

Cultural Tourism DC has successfully established a large number of heritage trails around DC. A partnership between the Navy Yard and Cultural Tourism DC should be established to explore developing a Navy Yard heritage trail as part of the same program. There may be limitations to integrating the Navy Yard into the current DC Heritage Trail program. However, forming a partnership even without integration to provide support in the development of the Navy Yard Heritage Trail will be vital to the implementation of the program.

Forest City Washington

The Navy Yard should work with the major local developer, Forest City Washington, to provide information to the new development’s residents about the amenities of the Navy Yard. Additionally, the Navy Yard should work with Forest City in their marketing of the neighborhood, including the Navy Yard and its cultural resources as a major attraction.

ACTIVATE PUBLIC SPACE

The partnerships for activating the identified public spaces include:

Capitol Bike Share

Capitol Bike Share has shown great success in Washington, DC. The Navy should work with Capitol Bike Share to get additional bike share locations closer to the Navy Yard, and more specifically a location on the Riverwalk. This partnership could have a major impact bringing new residents and tourists to the Navy Yard.

Capitol Riverfront BID

Strengthening a relationship with the BID will help draw people to the base’s new public spaces. The Navy Yard should hold meetings with the leadership of the BID to understand what types of uses the community would benefit from in regards to the space. These meetings would help the Navy
determine what programming should be implemented in the future, as well as the scale of the projects to implement.

**IMPROVED FOOD OPTIONS**

The implementation of additional on base food options will only be strengthened by partnerships with organizations around DC. More specifically some of the specific recommendations on types of food are contingent upon a partnership.

**Mobile Food Vendors Association of DC**

A partnership with the new Mobile Food Vendors Association of DC is necessary for bringing food trucks on the base. The Navy Yard should reach out to the organization and work with them to establish regular times for a variety of food trucks to come on or near the base.

**Capital Riverfront BID and Department of Transportation**

The BID as well as DOT are already working with local food trucks to set up recurring times for certain trucks to visit the neighborhood and locations near DOT. The Navy Yard should form a partnership with these groups to schedule locations and times of food trucks in the neighborhood to correspond with employee needs. Furthermore, the BID could be an invaluable resource for the construction, marketing, and operation of a new restaurant.

**Barracks Row Main Street**

Included in the report is a specific recommendation on the inclusion of food kiosks on the base. The Navy Yard should explore a partnership with the Barracks Row Main Street organization to have local restaurants occupy the kiosks as satellite locations.

**NEXT STEPS**

- Determine budget for implementation of the proposals and possible phasing for the projects
- Work with the Capitol Riverfront BID in finalizing the proposals before implementation
- Use the NEX food survey to determine the types of new vendors to bring on to the base
CONCLUSION

The goal of this Urban Planning Studio is to provide a comprehensive plan with attainable deliverables to address the issues of the client. The three issues given to us by NAVFAC Washington were examined by various planning techniques and assessed within the scope of holistic base improvement.

The recommendations prescribed by the studio group represent real world conditions and current realities on the base. All plans, whether the Navy Museum promenade or simply introducing coffee carts in building lobbies, represent careful thought and meticulous planning and precedent research.

The recommendations impact the three major stakeholders previously identified—US Navy, the community, and tourists. Though not every stakeholder benefits from every action, the collective steps provide far-reaching worth. Most important for the Navy is the PATH wayfinding system, to successfully guide people around the Navy Yard. The improved Riverwalk will give the community and visitors better access to information about the Navy Yard, the waterfront, and its history. Furthermore, the Navy Yard will benefit from new and better food options and enhanced open spaces that create new opportunities for interactions.

Furthermore, the implementation of one component will only strengthen the others. These proposals collectively fulfill the goals of the vision statement and satisfy the issues presented to by the Navy.

Changes both in Navy policy and physical alterations to the Navy Yard will allow the Navy to better connect its assets to the surrounding community, raise visitor awareness of the Navy Yard as a cultural attraction in Washington, DC, improve employee morale and wellness, and enhance the overall image of the US Navy.

The plans can be implemented in whole, in phases, or a la carte. All plans in this proposal have undergone a preliminary feasibility stress test encompassing financial viability, overall benefit, and time to completion.

As the neighborhood has changed, so has the Washington Navy Yard. The base’s population is projected to increase, making sound planning more paramount than ever. NAVFAC Washington’s decision to approach Columbia University and this studio group is a new and innovative approach to planning for the U.S. Navy. This group appreciates NAVFAC Washington and base leadership’s vision and thoughtfulness in addressing the anticipated needs of the Washington Navy Yard.
APPENDIX A: PROJECTS IN AREA

Among the many projects that are currently underway, the most notable include:

- New 11th Street Bridges
- New construction of mixed-use building totaling 379,000 sq. feet of office and 21,000 square feet of retail space
- 3-acre segmented Canal Park
- Foundry Loft apartments at The Yards Park that will add an additional 170 units of residences
- Second phase of the Capitol Quarter townhouses; a project that looks to expand with an additional 163 units

UPCOMING

There are a number of developments within the neighborhood, but it is important to think contextually in what will affect the Near Southeast neighborhood in its infrastructure projects, as well. These projects will have a major impact on the goals of the neighborhood. They have the capability of tying together multiple realms of access within only a few short years.

- Boathouse Row: this project area lies directly east of the 11th Street Bridges. In its process of reuse it looks to upgrade public usability, improve the environmental conditions of the area, preserve existing conditions, and fully utilize remaining land.
11th Street Bridges: this project is currently underway directly east of the Navy Yard. The goals of the project entail improving mobility of the area; providing a shared path for pedestrians, cyclists, and rail; replacing existing functionally deficient and structurally obsolete bridges; providing additional evacuation routes; and creating new trail connections.
• South Capitol Street: this is a major roadway that ties the outlying counties of Washington, DC to the downtown area. The renovation of this roadway will create a new bridge to improve safety, mobility, accessibility, and support economic development throughout the area; address major transportation issues; reconnect people and businesses back with neighborhoods south of the National Mall; and transform South Capitol Street into a grand urban gateway for commuters.

Design Alternative #2 Photo courtesy of SouthCapitolEIS.com
• Diamond Bridge: this bridge will provide a much simpler connection between Diamond Teague and Yards Parks. By providing a straight linear connection between the two parks the bridge will help legitimize the Riverwalk as being an easily navigable section of the riverfront. Additional objectives aim to create a marine environmental education center and mask pipes running to a DC water pumping station.

View from Diamond Park, Existing Conditions (photo courtesy of M. Paul Friedberg and Partners, LLC.)

View from Diamond Park, Proposed Bridge (photo courtesy of M. Paul Friedberg and Partners, LLC.)
APPENDIX B: SWOT

The Near Southeast neighborhood provides a unique landscape for the city of Washington, DC. Understanding the aspects that the community offers is vital for any party that looks to generate any benefit from the area.

STRENGTHS

• Redevelopment of the area has already begun: 10 million square feet of total space added, accounting for over $2.4 billion in total investment

• Land available for development: there is remaining space for new development

• Nationals’ baseball organization as a major support anchor: Nationals’ Park draws thousands of fans every game

• New office construction and absorption: as office space is added to the neighborhood the absorption of these workplaces by incoming businesses adds to the daytime population to provide patrons for local businesses

• Area’s proximity to downtown: The neighborhood is located within three miles of the National Mall. This proximity will allow the area to draw residual visitors who have visited the nation’s monuments

• Multi-modal capacity: the neighborhood offers various methods of transportation (i.e. subway, bus, auto access, pedestrian, bicycling); by 2030, it will offer a streetcar and BRT line to complement the existing options

• Uniqueness of area’s heritage: the area contains some of the nation’s most prolific history (the Washington Navy Yard is the headquarters to the entire US Navy, helped build the City of Washington, DC, and was one of the biggest contributors to the wartime efforts of our country)

• Maintained investment in existing infrastructure: infrastructure in the area is receiving a major rejuvenation as part of the continued effort of the Washington, DC Department of Transportation; among the many projects to be implemented will include the 11th Street Bridge, Fredrick Douglass Bridge, alterations to M Street, and the creation of the Diamond Bridge

• BID leadership: the BID has led the revival of the area by promulgating a new identity while perpetuating the development of the area

• Aesthetic nature of the parkland: even without the AWI the area still is a draw for many members of the community

WEAKNESSES

• Current recession: the recession has diminished prospective investors’ willingness to invest in the Near Southeast neighborhood

• High vacancy: due to the recession the vacancy rate as of 2009 was 23%; this figure could be alarming to potential developers
• Auto-dominant area/thoroughfare: the increased usage of New Jersey Avenue, M Street, South Capitol Street, and I-295 has created an environment that caters to the automobile

• Lack of ground floor storefront availability: there is currently a lack of ground floor availability along M Street that would allow numerous retail operations

OPPORTUNITIES

• Strategically-aimed redevelopment projects: redevelopment efforts have been specifically aimed at the riverfront as being the main support area

• Ability to create a unique waterfront: the Riverwalk has the potential to be a focal point for the DC area along with the main draw to the Anacostia River

• Continuing to redevelop M Street as a pedestrian friendly multi-modal corridor: by altering the street to be readily used by both pedestrians and cyclists the area will be accessible to a number of different users

• Develop immediate area surrounding ballpark to stand alone as a livable community: although there is a thriving market immediately surrounding the ballpark that feeds off of the game-goers, the area still cannot stand alone and needs major support facilities to complement its products

• Nurture existing heritage of area: with the Navy Yard, and the neighborhood’s proximity to Historic Anacostia and the National Mall, the Near Southeast neighborhood has much to offer to both its residents and visitors

• Balance a proper mix of development to satisfy demand of residents: although the area is currently being developed, planners still must take into consideration the ability of the area to meet residential demands. This is an area that seeks an increase in population by over a thousand residents over the next four years

• Create the area’s own sense of identity: one of the primary goals of the Capitol Riverfront BID is to envision a new distinctiveness for the neighborhood

• Creating the vital link in reconnecting DC with the Anacostia River: the AWI plan has set the stage for regions along the Anacostia River to attract individuals to the river’s edge

THREATS

• Potential for oversaturation of certain uses: with the area being heavily developed by numerous individuals comes the realization that the area may be oversaturated by any number of individual uses

• Ability for the Navy to collaborate with outside agencies: the US Navy looks to reach out to the surrounding community; however, the ability for the Navy to provide information and to collaborate with outside agencies is a continued struggle

• Misaligned prerogatives of various stakeholders: each stakeholder has their own objective that oftentimes will not correlate with the others
• Rapid development of area: it has only been since 2007 that the area has seen the addition of over ten million square feet of total space added. This number will increase in the foreseeable future to include over 35 million square feet of space being added to the neighborhood

• Exacerbation of negative externalities: with new development comes the creation of externalities that were not present in the neighborhood beforehand; these include many issues including both transportation and environmental impacts that have transpired due to the developed area

Sources: NeighborhoodInfo DC, DC Office of Planning, Boathouse Row Planning Study
APPENDIX C: POLICIES AND GOALS

Many external forces have affected the neighborhood’s development. The City of Washington, in its urban planning efforts, has created a number of goals that have influenced the Near Southeast neighborhood’s redevelopment. They are:

• Extending the Legacy: Planning America’s Capital for the 21st Century: Published in 1997, this vision plan for the controlled growth of the City extends its monumental core throughout the region. It redefines the core while reclaiming and reconnecting the city and its waterfront.

• The Memorials and Museums Master Plan: Published in 2001, this plan recommends placing memorials and museums outside of the city’s monumental core.

• The National Capital Urban Design and Security Plan: Implemented in 2001, this plan established standards for the design of perimeter security for buildings housing federal agencies. In addition, it establishes a sense of openness in the neighborhood for those using the area.

• The Anacostia Waterfront Initiative (AWI): Approved in 2003, the AWI seeks the creation of a new image for a river that was long since forgotten. It seeks to reconnect city residents to their waterfront.

• Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements: Published in 2004, this plan is the major tool for the development of the nation’s capital and guides the DC Planning Commission’s decision making process.

• The Monumental Core Framework Plan: Published in 2009, this plan redefines federal precincts in proximity to the National Mall as exciting points of interest all connected to each other. The goals of the proposal aim to instill many qualities of the National Mall along with the liveliness of the city throughout the monumental core.

• The Capital Space Plan: Published in 2010, this plan is formulated around six major goals that focus on key issues to help make the vision of a continuous park system a reality. It identifies significant recommendations that would best accomplish the goals of the collaborating partner agencies.

In addition to these planning documents, certain legislation has also influenced the recent changes in the Near Southeast neighborhood. The most significant are:

• Federal Hope VI funding: In 2001, the federal government granted a sum of over $37 million in federal funding to redevelop the 23-acre Capper/Carrollsburg public housing project within the neighborhood as a mixed-income community. This project has altered the housing stock and the socioeconomic makeup of the area.
• Base Realignment and Closure Act (BRAC): 
BRAC is responsible for the closure of excess military installations and the realignment of inventory to reduce expenditures on operations and maintenance. It is meant to increase military efficiency through consolidation. The Navy Yard became a consolidation site in 2005.

• Capitol Riverfront Business Improvement District (BID):
The BID promotes the increasing development of the neighborhood in addition to changing its image.
APPENDIX D: FOOD SURVEY

1. On average, how many times a week do you purchase meals within the installation? (check one)
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 other

2. If you purchase lunch within the installation, on average how much do you usually spend on one meal? (write amount below)
   __________

3. How satisfied are you with the quality of food options offered on base?
   (most satisfied to least satisfied scale here)

4. How satisfied are you with the quantity of food options offered on base?
   (most satisfied to least satisfied scale here)

5. On average, how many times a week during the workday do you purchase meals outside of the installation? (check one)
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 other

6. Do these meals come from the surrounding neighborhood? (check one)
   Yes No Sometimes

7. Specifically which area outside of the installation do these meals come from? (write response below)
   ______________

8. If you eat meals from outside of the installation, how do you get them? (Check all that apply)
   Walk Bike Metro Bus Shuttle Delivery Other________

9. If you purchase lunch from outside of the Navy Yard, on average how much do you usually spend on one meal? (write response below)
   __________

10. On average, about how many times do you bring your meals from home to work? (check one)
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 other

11. How likely are you to purchase meals on base if new lunch options were offered?
    (most likely to least likely scale here)

12. Please select which new food options you would likely purchase if made available on base. Assume existing food options would be supplemented or replaced by a different company. (Check all that apply)
    American (traditional) BBQ Buffets Burgers Chinese Coffee/Tea Delis Fast food Gluten-free Healthy fare Latin American Mediterranean Mexican Pizza Salads Sandwiches Soup Soul food Sushi Thai Vegetarian Vegan

12. In which area(s) would you like to see an increase in lunch options? (Check all that apply)
    [NOTE: This will include a map of areas within the Navy Yard from which people can choose]
    Within the Navy Yard Outside of the Navy Yard
13. Which of the following food options would you like to see at the Navy Yard? (Check all that apply) [NOTE: these would include pictures]
   - New restaurant
   - Food kiosks
   - Temporary food trucks
   - Temporary food carts
   - Additional food at Town Center
   - Other

14. Would you consider spending slightly more money on lunch than you usually do if you were able to get the options you wanted?
   - Yes
   - No